

REMARKS**35 U.S.C. § 103. Claim Rejections.**

4-17. The Office Action states that Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
5 §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dasan, USPN 5,761,662, in view of Rose,
USPN 5,724,567.

Applicant has amended Independent Claim 1, to claim a method for inspecting
any of the properties of a computer, said computer's configuration, contents of
10 said computer's storage devices, said computer's peripherals, and said
computer's environment, comprising the steps of:

providing at least one inspector library at said computer, said at least one
inspector library comprising at least one inspector and associated methods;

evaluating subexpressions at said computer with said at least one
15 inspector; and

performing with said inspector at said computer any of mathematico-
logical calculations, executing computational algorithms, returning results of
system calls, accessing contents of storage devices, and querying devices or
remote computers to inspect any of said properties of said computer, said
20 computer's configuration, contents of said computer's storage devices, said
computer's peripherals, and said computer's environment.

Support is seen in the Application as filed, at least on page 5, line 20 to page 6,
line 26; on page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 7; on page 14, line 1 to page 15, line 5;
25 on page 16, line 5-10; on page 37, lines 14-19; on page 41, line 22 to page 42,
line 2; on page 44, line 23 to page 46, line 5; on page 73, lines 10-26; on page
79, line 20 to page 81, line 19; on page 82, line 12 to page 83, line 4; on page
84, line 8 to page 106, line 18; in Claims 1, 10, 37, 40 and 41; and in Figures 2,
3, 6, 7-10, 11-17 and 21-24.

30

Applicant has amended independent Claim 10, to claim an Inspector library for inspecting any of the properties of a computer, said computer's configuration, contents of said computer's storage devices, said computer's peripherals, and said computer's environment, said Inspector library comprising:

5 at least one inspector at said computer which is invoked as part of a continual relevance evaluation process; and

 one or more Inspector methods for performing at said computer any of mathematico-logical calculations, executing computational algorithms, returning the results of system calls, accessing the contents of storage devices, and
10 querying devices or remote computers to inspect any of the properties of a computer, said computer's configuration, contents of said computer's storage devices, said computer's peripherals, and said computer's environment.

Support is seen in the Application as filed, at least on page 5, line 20 to page 6,
15 line 26; on page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 7; on page 14, line 1 to page 15, line 5; on page 16, line 5-10; on page 37, lines 14-19; on page 41, line 22 to page 42, line 2; on page 44, line 23 to page 46, line 5; on page 73, lines 10-26; on page 79, line 20 to page 81, line 19; on page 82, line 12 to page 83, line 4; on page 84, line 8 to page 106, line 18; in Claims 1, 10, 37, 40 and 41; and in Figures 2,
20 3, 6, 7-10, 11-17 and 21-24.

Applicant has amended Independent Claim 37, to claim, in a system including computational devices connected by a communications network, said system comprising a communications apparatus for linking an advice provider to an
25 advice consumer, said communications apparatus comprising specific units of advice to be shared, digital documents conveying said advice, said advice provider for broadcasting said advice in the form of advisories, said advice consumer for receiving said advisories, wherein advisories are broadcast over said communications network from said advice provider to said advice
30 consumer, a communications protocol for narrowly-focused targeting of said advisories to said advice consumer by automatically matching advisories with an

advice consumer for whom said advisories are relevant, and an inspector dispatcher associated with an advice client computer for any of continuously and at scheduled intervals performing relevance determination, wherein said relevance determination is driven by a database of relevance clauses which can be continually evaluated, at least one inspector library, comprising:

at least one inspector located at said advice client computer; and associated methods for evaluating subexpressions with said at least one inspector at said advice client computer;

wherein said inspector library is invoked by said inspector dispatcher as part of said relevance determination process; and

wherein said inspector performs at said advice client computer any of mathematico-logical calculations, executes computational algorithms, returns the results of system calls, accesses the contents of storage devices, and queries devices or remote computers.

Support is seen in the Application as filed, at least on page 6, line 4 to page 8, line 19; on page 17, line 12 to page 20, line 5; on page 32, line 20 to page 33, line 14; on page 35, line 1 to page 36, line 3; on page 37, lines 14-19; on page 38, line 10 to page 39, line 1; on page 41, line 22 to page 42, line 2; on page 44, line 23 to page 46, line 5; on page 73, lines 10-26; on page 79, line 20 to page 81, line 19; on page 82, line 12 to page 83, line 4; on page 84, line 8 to page 106, line 18; on page 111, line 18 to page 113, line 9; and in Figures 1-3, 6, 7-10, 11-17 and 21-24.

Applicant has amended independent Claim 40, to claim a method for inspecting a computer at a remote location any of the properties of said computer, said computer's configuration, contents of said computer's storage devices, said computer's peripherals, and said computer's environment, comprising the steps of:

sending one or more relevance clauses to said computer at said remote location;

providing at least one inspector library at said computer at said remote location, said at least one inspector library comprising at least one inspector and associated methods;

5 evaluating said one or more relevance clauses with said at least one inspector at said computer at said remote location; and

returning evaluation results from said computer at said remote location after a user of said computer is made aware of what is being transferred.

Support is seen in the Application as filed, at least on page 7, line 21 to page 9, line 2; on page 29, lines 12-16; ; on page 41, line 22 to page 42, line 2; on page 44, line 23 to page 47, line 21; on page 62, line 19 to page 64, line 18; on page 73, lines 10-26; on page 79, line 20 to page 81, line 19; on page 82, line 12 to page 83, line 4; on page 84, line 8 to page 106, line 18; and in Figures 2, 3, 6, 7-10, 11-17 and 21-24.

15

Applicant has amended independent Claim 41, to claim, in a system comprising a master computer, a method for inspecting any of the properties of a slave computer, said slave computer's configuration, contents of said slave computer's storage devices, said slave computer's peripherals, and said slave computer's environment, comprising the steps of:

20 providing at least one inspector library at said slave computer, said at least one inspector library comprising at least one inspector and associated methods;

25 evaluating one or more relevance clauses at said slave computer with said at least one inspector;

wherein said relevance clauses evaluation proceeds in connection with said slave computer as controlled by said master computer.

Support is seen in the Application as filed, at least on page 7, line 21 to page 9, line 2; on page 29, lines 12-16; on page 41, line 22 to page 42, line 2; on page 44, line 23 to page 46, line 5; on page 62, line 19 to page 64, line 18; on page

73, lines 10-26; on page 79, line 20 to page 81, line 19; on page 82, line 12 to page 83, line 4; on page 84, line 8 to page 106, line 18; on page 254, line 10 to page 258, line 17; and in Figures 2, 3, 6, 7-10, 11-17 and 25.

- 5 Applicant has added new claims 42-45, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the inspection of remote affiliated computers. Support is seen in the Application as filed, at least on page 15, lines 7-10; on page 22, line 25 to page 23, line 2; on page 41, line 22 to page 42, line 2; and in Claims 1, 10, 37, 40, and 41.

10

Applicant respectfully submits that Dasan and Rose et al., taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the present invention, as claimed in Claim 1, 10, 37, 40, and 41, as amended.

- 15 Dasan describes personalized information retrieval using a user-defined profile, as seen at least in the Abstract, wherein:

20 "An automatic method and system for retrieving information based on a user-defined profile (e.g. a personalized newspaper). A user-controlled client establishes communication with a stateless server, the server presenting a list of options to the client between the server and the client. The client provides an identification of the user-defined profile. The server engages a first application program, the first application program retrieving the user-defined profile wherein the user-defined profile
25 identifies information which is of interest to the user. The first application program examines a database of information and automatically retrieves a subset of the information from the database based upon which information is of interest to the user as identified in the user-defined profile. The server presents the subset of the information from the database as
30 generated by the first application program to the client. The first application program can store a file containing the user-defined profile in

order to retain a state of the user-profile, and cause the stateless server to emulate a server which retains its state from session to session."

As noted in the Office Action, Dasan "does not specifically disclose the inspector
5 performing any of mathematico-logical calculations, executing computational algorithms, returning results of system calls, accessing contents of storage devices, and querying devices or remote computers to inspect any properties of the computer, the computer's configuration, contents of the computer's storage devices, the computer's peripherals, the computer's environment, or remote
10 affiliated computers."

As seen at least in col. 3, lines 21-23, Dasan describes a "method and apparatus for automatically scanning information using a user-defined profile, and providing relevant stories from that information to a user based upon that profile".

15 Details regarding entry and/or editing of a user profile in Dasan are seen at least in col. 4, lines 18-26, wherein:

"the user is able to connect to the remote server and specify a user
20 profile, setting forth his interests. The user is able to specify the context for the information to be searched (e.g. the date). The user is able to save the profile on the remote machine. Finally the user is able to retrieve the personal profile (with any access control, if desired) and edit (add or delete entries) and save it for future operations."

25 User profiles are created and stored in local files by the server, as seen at least in col. 5, line 5 to col. 6, line 6, wherein:

"The user profile or requests which are received from the CGI 220 in the
30 server 150 cause the newspaper generator to perform certain actions. For example, in the case of a profile creation, the profile is created and stored

in local files, such as 410, which may be accessed at a later time by the server during editing operations or during creation of the newspaper. In this way, the stateless protocol of HTTP is transformed into a state-protocol, wherein the client or user profile is recalled from session to session."

5

Details regarding the generation of a newspaper are seen in *Dasan*, at least in Fig. 4, Fig. 5a, in col. 5, lines 53-64, and in col. 6, lines 11-48, wherein:

10 "As illustrated, the newspaper generator 400 uses a plurality of raw news sources 420, 430, and 440, which may be any of a number of available raw news feeds. For example, each of these may be a separate news source or wire service (e.g. Reuters, Associated Press), while another may be an electronic discussion group (e.g. a USENet newsgroup). Any
15 number or types of sources may be used, according to implementation.

FIGS. 5a and 5b illustrates the logic of the operation of the personal newspaper generator. First, at step 502, the newspaper's front page, or welcome screen is displayed. This is the page which is displayed when
20 the use first accesses the server via the specification of a URL (Uniform Resource Locator). A display screen, such as 600 illustrated in FIG. 6, is displayed upon the user's console. Options and other data entered on the form displayed on the console are committed, causing invocation of the newspaper generation program, upon selection by the user of the "doit"
25 icon 610 on display 600. At step 504, the user can then enter, via the forms support in the browser, a profile or user name in field 602. This is enabled by selecting using a selection device or other means, and filling in the selected blank with the profile name (typically, an e-mail address of the user). If desired in the given implementation, access control may be
30 performed at step 506, wherein the user is queried for a password.

If the user wishes to edit the profile as detected at step 508, which is indicated by the selection of the user interface object 604, then process 500 proceeds to FIG. 5b. If not (user interface object 606 is selected), then the user may specify a date for which the personal newspaper will be generated, such as by filling in the field 608 in the user interface form, by a pull-down, pop-up menu, or other means. Then, at step 512 it is determined whether the profile for the user exists. If so, then the newspaper is generated using the stored profile. According to the topics/subject/keywords selected by the user in his profile, the raw news source(s) are scanned, and that information matching the profile is gathered at step 514. If the profile does not exist, then at step 516, the user is given the options for creating and editing the profile."

Applicant submits therefore, that Dasan clearly describes the transfer of a user profile from a user at client computer to a server, e.g. server 150, by which the server 150 produces "filtered information", using the provided user profile, such as through a newspaper generator (400) (Fig. 5), and sends the "filtered information" to the client computer 150, i.e. server responses 160 (FIG. 1).

Rose describes a system for directing relevance-ranked data objects to computer users, as seen at least in the Abstract, wherein:

"An information access system stores items of information in an unstructured global database. When a user requests access to the system, the system delivers to that user an identification of only those items of information which are believed to be relevant to the user's interest. The determination as to the items of information that are relevant to a user is carried out by ranking each available item in accordance with any one or more techniques. In one approach, the content of each document is matched with an adaptive profile of a user's interest. In another approach, a feedback mechanism is provided to allow users to

indicate their degree of interest in each item of information. These indications are used to determine whether other users, who have similar or dissimilar interests, will find a particular item to be relevant."

- 5 Determination of relevance for information in Rose is seen at least in col. 2, lines 37-48, wherein:

10 "The determination as to the items of information that are believed to be important to a user is carried out by ranking each available item. A variety of techniques can be used to rank the information. For example, the content of each document can be matched with an adaptive profile of a user's interest. Alternatively, or in addition, a feedback mechanism can be provided, to allow users to indicate their degree of interest in each retrieved document. These indications can be used to determine whether
15 other users, who typically agree or disagree with a given user, will find the document to be of interest."

Details regarding operation of the system, using user profiles stored in a user database 18, is seen at least in Fig. 2, and in col. 4, lines 26-44, wherein"

20 "In the operation of the system, when a user desires to retrieve messages, the user accesses the system through the client program on one of the client machines 12, 14. As part of the access procedure, the user may be required to log into the system. Through the use of a password or other
25 appropriate form of identification, the user's identity is provided to the server 10, which acknowledges the user's right to access the system or disconnects the client machine if the user has not been authorized. When the access procedure is successful, the message server 16 on the server machine retrieves the user's profile from the user database 18. This profile
30 is used to rank the messages stored within the system. The particular information within the user's profile will be based upon the ranking

technique that is employed, as described in detail hereinafter. Once the user's profile is retrieved, all of the available messages are ranked on the basis of a predicted degree of relevance to the user. Once the messages have been ranked, a list is formed in which the messages are sorted from highest to lowest ranking."

Applicant submits, therefore that determination of relevance in Rose takes place at the server level, wherein the server uses user profiles and/or user entered feedback to rank information to be delivered back to users at remote computers.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Dasan and Rose, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the present invention, as claimed in Claim 1, 10, 37, 40, and 41, as amended.

In regard to Claim 1 and Claim 10, as amended, neither Dasan nor Rose et al. teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a method or apparatus comprising an inspector within a computer, which evaluates subexpressions at the computer, *i.e.* locally, and performs at the computer, *i.e.* locally, any of mathematico-logical calculations, executing computational algorithms, returning results of system calls, accessing contents of storage devices, and querying devices or remote computers to inspect any of said properties of the computer, said computer's configuration, contents of the computer's storage devices, the computer's peripherals, and the computer's environment.

As well, both Dasan and Rose et al. teach away from Claim 1 and 10, as amended, as they both receive submitted or entered profile or feedback from a user, use the profile or feedback, remotely, *i.e.* through a server, to filter or rank information, and then deliver the filtered or ranked information back to the user. Relevance or ranking is therefore determined on the server side, not locally to a computer.

Therefore, even in combination, Dasan and Rose et al. fail to meet Claim 1 and Claim 10, as amended. It would take significant modification and undue experimentation to meet Claim 1 and Claim 10, as amended.

5 In regard to Claim 37, as amended, neither Dasan nor Rose et al. teach or suggest, in a communications apparatus for linking an advice provider to an advice consumer, *inter alia*, an inspector located at said advice client computer, and associated methods for evaluating subexpressions with the inspector at the advice client computer, *i.e.* locally, wherein the inspector performs at the advice client computer, *i.e.* locally, any of mathematico-logical calculations, executes
10 computational algorithms, returns the results of system calls, accesses the contents of storage devices, and queries devices or remote computers.

As well, both Dasan and Rose et al. teach away from Claim 37, as amended, as
15 they both receive submitted or entered profile or feedback from a user, use the profile or feedback, remotely, *i.e.* through a server, to filter or rank information, and then deliver the filtered or ranked information to the user. Relevance or ranking is therefore determined on the server side, not locally to a computer.

20 Therefore, even in combination, Dasan and Rose et al. fail to meet Claim 37, as amended. It would take significant modification and undue experimentation to meet Claim 37, as amended.

In regard to Claim 40, as amended, neither Dasan nor Rose et al. teach or
25 suggest, *inter alia*, sending one or more relevance clauses to a computer at a remote location; providing at least one inspector library at the computer at said remote location, the least one inspector library comprising at least one inspector and associated methods; evaluating one or more relevance clauses with the at least one inspector at the computer at said remote location; and returning
30 evaluation results from the computer at the remote location after a user of the computer is made aware of what is being transferred.

As well, the systems and methods described by both Dasan and Rose et al. are significantly different from Claim 40, as amended, as they both receive submitted or entered profile or feedback from a user, use the profile or feedback through a
5 server, filter or rank information, and then deliver the filtered or ranked information to the user. Relevance or ranking is therefore determined on the server side, not locally to a remote computer.

Therefore, even in combination, Dasan and Rose et al. fail to meet Claim 40, as
10 amended. It would take significant modification and undue experimentation to meet Claim 40, as amended.

In regard to Claim 41, as amended, neither Dasan nor Rose et al. teach or suggest, in a system comprising a master computer and a slave computer, inter
15 alia, providing at least one inspector library at the slave computer, the at least one inspector library comprising at least one inspector and associated methods; and evaluating one or more relevance clauses at the slave computer, *i.e.* locally, the at least one inspector, wherein the relevance clauses evaluation proceeds in connection with the slave computer as controlled by the master computer.

20 As well, the systems and methods described by both Dasan and Rose et al. are significantly different from Claim 41, as amended, as they both receive submitted or entered profile or feedback from a user, use the profile or feedback through a server to filter or rank information, and then deliver the filtered or ranked
25 information to the user. Relevance or ranking is therefore determined on the server side, not locally to a remote computer.

Therefore, even in combination, Dasan and Rose et al. fail to meet Claim 41, as
30 amended. It would take significant modification and undue experimentation to meet Claim 41, as amended.


Applicant therefore submits that Claims 1, 10, 37, 40, and 41 as amended, overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dasan, USPN 5,761,662, in view of Rose, USPN 5,724,567. As Claims 2-9 and 43 depend from Claim 1, as Claims 11-36 and 44 depend from Claim 10, as
5 Claims 38 and 39 depend from Claim 37, as Claim 45 depends from Claim 40, and as Claim 42 depends from Claim 41, and inherently include all the limitations of the Claims from which they depend, Claims 2-9, 11-36, 38, 39 and 42-45 are seen to be patentable as well.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1-41, as amended, and dependent Claims 42-45, as added, overcome the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

- 5 Applicant also submits that the amendments do not introduce new matter into the Application. Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the invention to be in condition for allowance. Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore
- 10 allowed to issue as a United States Patent.

Respectfully Submitted,



15

Michael Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862